



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,849	06/20/2005	Paul Stephens	CE00516UM	7950

20280 7590 06/11/2010
MOTOROLA INC
600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45
W4 - 39Q
LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343

EXAMINER

KARIKARI, KWASI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

06/11/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DOCKETING.LIBERTYVILLE@MOTOROLA.COM
ADB035@Motorola.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte PAUL STEPHENS

Appeal 2009-003132
Application 10/539,849
Technology Center 2600

Decided: June 9, 2010

Before JOSEPH F. RUGGIERO, CARLA M. KRIVAK, and
BRADLEY W. BAUMEISTER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BAUMEISTER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's final rejection of claims 32-55. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We AFFIRM.

[Appellant's invention relates to a] method (300) of providing location based services using a wireless communication system (100, 200) that facilitates communication to and/or from a plurality of communication units (250-262). The method includes the step of transmitting a wireless message (220), from a mobile service provider (112) to a number of communication devices in a location (210). The wireless message indicates a service to be provided by the mobile service provider (112) at the location (210). This enables mobile service providers to enhance their business via their mobile communication device, i.e. advertise their services to a geographically near, group of users. Preferably the recipient group of users have previously subscribed to, or registered their interest in, the services provided by the mobile service provider.

(Abstract).

Independent claim 32 illustrative, reading as follows with emphasis added to the disputed claim language:

32. A method of providing location based services by a mobile service provider using a wireless communication system that facilitates communication with a plurality of communication units, the method comprising:

providing location information, via a mobile communication unit adapted for use by the mobile service provider *traveling to a previously undisclosed location where a service is to be performed* of at least one of a current location of, and a location to be visited by, the mobile service provider to an intermediate device; and

initiating the transmission of a wireless message, by the intermediate device in dependence on the location information

provided by the mobile service provider, to a number of communication devices in the at least one of the current location of, and the location to be visited by, the mobile service provider, wherein said wireless message indicates the service to be provided by said mobile service provider at the at least one of the current location of, and the location to be visited by, the mobile service provider.

The Examiner initially rejected all of claims 32-55 as either anticipated by, or obvious over, Haddad, US 2003/0137435 (July 24, 2003) (*see* Non-Final Rejection, mailed Sep. 19, 2006). Haddad discloses a mobile communication system for alerting a user to an expected occurrence of an event that has a start time that can be more accurately predicted as the time of the event approaches (Haddad, Abstract).

In response to the rejections based upon Haddad, Appellant amended the two independent claims, claims 32 and 52, to include the language emphasized above, “traveling to a previously undisclosed location where a service is to be performed” (*see* Amendment filed Feb. 20, 2007). Appellant asserts that the originally-filed Specification’s use of the term “roaming” adequately supports the claim amendment regarding the “previously undisclosed location” because a general purpose dictionary defines roaming “as moving about without purpose or plan; (i.e., wander)” (App. Br. 4-6). Appellant also asserts that the claim amendments overcome the rejections over Haddad because Haddad is only directed to predetermined or expected events and occurrences, and further because Kinnunen, US 2001/0018349 (Aug. 30, 2001), fails to account for Haddad’s deficiencies (App. Br. 6-8).

The Examiner conversely finds that the claim limitations that were later added by amendment (1) constitute new matter, and (2) still do not distinguish over Haddad. Accordingly:

I. Claims 32-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 for failing to comply with the written description requirement. The first issue presented on appeal relates to the written description rejection: Does the originally-filed Specification's recitation of "roaming" provide adequate support for the later-added claim language, "travelling to a previously undisclosed location"?

II. Claims 32-47 and 49-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Haddad. Claim 48 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Haddad in view of Kinnunen. The second issue on appeal relates to these art-based rejections: Does Haddad additionally disclose the claimed feature of "the mobile service provider traveling to a previously undisclosed location where a service is to be performed" (*see* App. Br. 6-7 (*citing* claim 32))?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The record supports the following Findings of Fact by a preponderance of the evidence:

1. As applied to cellular telephone communications, "roaming" means:
 - "Use of a cellular phone outside its calling area. Whereas the incoming calls may be free (being charged to the calling party), outgoing calls typically cost more than normal in the roaming mode" (available at <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/roaming.html>);

- “a customer’s use of a cellular phone outside the region served by his or her carrier” (available at <http://www.yourdictionary.com/roaming>).

2. Haddad states (§ [0047]):

It will be appreciated that [Haddad’s] invention is applicable to other forms of transport beyond buses which have unpredictable arrival and/or departure times. . . It is also possible for a user to be given advance notice of the arrival of non route-fixed transport, such as, a taxi or car: if the position of the vehicle is known and the pick up point known, an advance notice signal can be generated a suitable time before the car arrives.

ANALYSIS

I.

The originally-filed Specification’s recitation of “roaming” does not provide adequate support for the later-added claim language, “travelling to a previously undisclosed location.” As used in the context of cellular telephone communications, “roaming” refers to the use of a cellular phone outside of the user’s home service area (Fact 1). We find no evidence that “roaming,” in this particular context, further precludes the user from either formulating a travel plan before embarking upon a journey or disclosing the intended travel plans to others. Accordingly, we sustain the Examiner’s rejection of claims 32-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1.

II.

We now turn to the question of whether Appellant’s amendment overcomes the anticipation and obviousness rejections based upon Haddad. Towards this end, we first note that neither of independent claims 32 and 52 recites any objective baseline for determining relative to what reference time

the claimed location is previously undisclosed. As such, Haddad may be reasonably interpreted as not only disclosing a mobile communication system that alerts a user to the occurrence of an expected event, but also disclosing the claimed feature of “the mobile service provider traveling to a previously undisclosed location where a service is to be performed.”

More specifically, Haddad discloses that the invention can be used to “[give] advance notice of the arrival of non route-fixed transport, such as, a taxi. . . if the position of the vehicle is known and the pick up point known” (Fact 2). Implicit in the case of such a taxi-service scenario, the pick-up location is not known by the cab driver (or service provider) until the passenger makes the transport request. As such, the pick-up location may be reasonably interpreted as constituting a “previously undisclosed location.” If we were to alternatively find this interpretation to be unreasonably broad, we would raise a significant question of what metes and bounds are, in fact, covered by the claim language, “previously undisclosed location.”

For the foregoing reasons, then, Appellant has not persuaded us of error in the Examiner’s anticipation rejection of claims 32 and 52. Accordingly, we will sustain the Examiner’s decision rejecting those claims and also claims 33-47, 49-51, and 53-55 which depend from claims 32 and 52. Likewise, we will also sustain the Examiner’s obviousness rejection of claim 48 over Haddad and Kinnunen. Appellant has not particularly pointed out errors in the Examiner’s reasoning to persuasively rebut the Examiner’s prima facie case of obviousness. Rather, Appellant merely reiterates the same arguments with respect to the alleged deficiencies of Haddad in

connection with independent claim 32 (App. Br. 9). We are not persuaded by these arguments, however, for the same reasons discussed above.

DECISION

The Examiner's decision rejecting claims 32-55 is affirmed.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

ORDER

AFFIRMED

tkl

MOTOROLA INC
600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45
W4 - 39Q
LIBERTYVILLE IL 60048-5343